APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/688,574	10/17/2003	Nitin Jhingan	END920030060US1 (16845)	2480

23389 7590 01/23/2008	EXAMINER	
SCULLY SCOTT MURPHY & PRESSER, PC	CHEN, TE Y	
400 GARDEN CITY PLAZA		
SUITE 300	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
GARDEN CITY, NY 11530	2161	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
01/23/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/688,574	JHINGAN, NITIN
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Susan Y. Chen	2161	

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>30 October 2007</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-20* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-20* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

        1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

        2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

        3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

Response to Amendment

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on October 30, 2007 has been entered.

This office action is in response to the amendment filed on October 30, 2007.

Claims 1-20 are pending for examination, claims 1, 7 and 13 have been amended.

Specification

The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction of the following is required:

As to claims 13-18, the claimed subject matters such as "a program storage device" and "machine" are lacking of antecedent basis, because they are not clearly defined in the instant specification.

Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 7-18, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. *§ 101 because* the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

As to claims 7-12, these system claims do not contain any physical hardware to perform the claimed mapping utility, they are merely software per se.

As to claims 13-18, these claims recite subject matters such as "a program storage device" and "machine" that are not defined in the instant specification, thus, based on the broadest claim interpretation, these claimed subject matters could include "virtual storage device" and "virtual machine" which render these claims to be non-statutory.

To expedite a complete examination of the instant application the claims rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 (nonstatutory) above are further rejected as set forth below in anticipation of applicant amending these claims to place them within the four statutory categories of invention.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by

Michaelides (U.S. Publication No. 2004/0181753).

Claim 1:

Michaelides discloses a method for mapping data from source to a data

destination [e.g., Abstract, lines 6-9], comprising the steps:

Providing a plurality of separate components for performing defined functions to

map the data from the source to the destination [e.g., The title, Abstract, Fig. 6, section

0058], the plurality of components performing the steps of

i) using a first of the components for reading data from the source [e.g., the unit

103, Fig. 6 and associated texts, the use of the generic software adapter GUI to

read/feed from source data at section: 0062];

ii) using a second of the components for receiving the data from the first of the

components and for processing the read data according to a set of rules [e.g., units:

101, 102, 105, of Fig. 6 and associated texts], said second component including a

formatter for converting selected dates from a first format to a second format, thereby

eliminating the need for writing code for formatting the selected dates [e.g., The

formatting engine 102 allows the end-user to format data in virtually infinite

combinations at section 0058 & appendix I at page 12]; and

iii) using the third of the components for receiving the data from the second of the

component and loading the processed data into the destination [e.g., the unit 104, Fig. 6

and associated texts, a target feed is activated, data is load from the source feed and

written to the target at section: 0062].

Wherein, each of the components is interactively operated independently of the

others, and can be dynamically modified, adjusted, and replaced independently [e.g.,

sections: 0050-0051, 0064 - 0067] to facilitate mapping data from a plurality of different

data source into the data destination [e.g., sections: 0050-0051, Fig(s). 9-10 and

associated texts].

Claim 2:

Except the features recited in claim 1, Michaelides further discloses the steps of

iv) verifying the integrity of the read data [e.g., the use of Verify Button at section:

0095; the use of Verified feed at section: 0191; the use of LdapUtilities at section: 0198];

and

v) logging results into a file [e.g., the use of GALogger at section: 0199].

Claim 3:

Except the features recited in claim 2, Michaelides further discloses a respective one of the components performs each of the steps (i) – (v) [e.g., the unit 50, Fig. 6 and associated texts].

Claim 4:

Except the features recited in claim 1, Michaelides further discloses that the data source is a flat file [e.g., the units: FileFeedDataSourceImpl, FixedFileFeedDataSourceReaderImpl, etc at section: 0202] and the destination is a database [e.g., section: 0203].

Claim 5:

Except the features recited in claim 2, Michaelides further discloses that the plurality of components perform the further step of sending the results, by e-mail to a configured list of email addresses [e.g., Fig. 14 and associated texts; section: 0193].

Claim 6:

Except the features recited in claim 1, Michaelides further discloses that the step of formatting the read data for placement in the data destination [e.g., the use of Formatting engine 102, Fig. 6 and associated texts].

As to claims 7-12 and 13-18, these claims recite the same features as claims 1-6

in form of a framework and program storage medium, hence, are rejected for the same

reason.

As to claim 19, Michaelides further discloses the following as claimed,

comprising:

the data destination is a database [e.g., section: 0064, the unit: 104, Fig. 1 and

associated texts];

the step of providing a plurality of separate components includes the further step

of using fixed length fields in the data source to the database for determining the start

position, the length, what database column the fields map to, which database tables the

fields map to, whether the fields can be updated or not, what kinds of formatting to be

applied on the fields, for calling a formatter [e.g., the unit 102, Fig. 1] to reformat data

from the data source and for managing transactions by starting a transaction when a

first record is read and committing or rolling back a transaction when a defined record is

encountered [e.g., Fig. 10 and associated texts]; and

the step of a system administrator updating the components during the use of the

components [e.g., Sections: 0193-0198, Fig(s). 32-34].

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Michaelides (U.S. Publication No. 2004/0181753) in view of Martin (U.S. Patent No.

6,704,743).

As to claim 20, Except the features recited in claim 19, Michaelides further

discloses that:

the first component operates in series between the data source and the second

component [e.g., section: 0064, Fig. 10 and associated texts];

the third component operates in series between the second component and the

data destination [e.g., section: 0065, Fig. 11 and associated texts].

Michaelides did not specifically disclose that the second component verifies the

integrity of the read data by checking for counts and data consistencies.

However, Martin discloses the claimed features [e.g., Abstract, col. 12, lines 36 –

67, Fig(s) 4-9 and associated texts].

Michaelides and Martin are both in the same endeavor to facilitate the mapping

data from data source to data destination via a user interface model [e.g., Michaelides:

the unit 114, Fig. 7; Martin: col. 43, lines 28 – 57], hence, with the teachings of

Michaelides and Martin in front of him/her, it would have been obvious for an ordinary

skilled person at the time the invention was made to apply Martin's checking for counts

and data consistencies technique in Michaelides's system, because by doing so, as

suggested by Martin, the combined system will provide a faster synchronization

between the source to target data representations without the use of any separate

garbage collection operations, thereby minimizing the overhead associated with

memory management activities [e.g., Martin: col. 12, lines 36 – 67].

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed on October 30, 2007 have been fully considered but

they are not persuasive.

The examiner disagrees with applicant's piecemeal interpretation and arguments

based on the newly amended claims that "Michaelides does not disclose or render

obvious providing the above -mentioned second component with this formatter. This

formatter helps the components archieve the desired independent operation by, as

maintained above, eliminating the need for writing code for formatting the selected

dates."

In response to the above arguments, the examiner directs applicant's attention to the

following excerpts disclosed by Michaelides:

"A software adapter is controlled by metadata. For example, templates are
provided for receiving information to define a specific adapter for converting
a given source format to a given target format. Instead of coding a required
data format transformation, the user fills out a template, and the template is

stored into a database. The software adapter accesses that information to

determine what information is mapped from the source stream to the target

stream, and how to transform the mapped information. There is no need to

update the information in the database unless there is a change in the source

or target format of the mapped information. In a preferred implementation, the

software adapter includes an administration tool and graphical user interface,

a rule database, a formatting engine, a feed database, and a transformation

engine." (Abstract)

Michaelides further clearly disclosed at least three types of data including Date,

Alpha and numeric being processed by the Formatting engine as shown by the unit

102, Fig. 6. In addition, Michaelides clearly disclosed that "The formatting engine

102 allows the end-user to format data in virtually infinite combinations. This

eliminates integration barriers caused by differing data formats across multiple

systems, including mainframe systems." (e.g., section: 0058 & Appendix I)

As set forth above, Michaelides clearly discloses a computer system provides a

plurality of components comprising a generic software adapter GUI to read

information from source database as the claimed first component to a formatting

engine, that Instead of coding a required data format transformation allows a user to

select data format transformation via templates filling technique and formatting the

data in virtually infinite combinations including date, alpha and numeric as the

claimed second components. Moreover, the system receives the data from the

second components to lode/store the processed data into a data destination for

reuse (e.g., the feed database 104 of Fig. 6 and associated texts) as the claimed

third component. Thus, in contrary to applicant's arguments, Michaelides clearly

anticipates the claimed features.

As to the rest of arguments which recites more details than the claims, because

applicant does not clearly point out the patentable novelty which he or she thinks the

claims present in view of the state of the art disclosed by the references cited or the

objections made. Further, they do not show how the amendments avoid such

references or objections. The examiner concludes that the prior art read on the

claimed features.

Conclusion

To expedite the process of re-examination, the examiner requests that all future

correspondences in regard to overcoming prior art rejections or other issues (e.g. 35

U.S.C. 101) set forth by the Examiner prior to the office action, that applicant should

provide and link to the most specific page and line numbers of the disclosure where

best support is found (see 35 U.S.C. 132).

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to

applicant's disclosure:

Dingman et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,820,135) which disclosed a modeless event-

driven data transformation system to convert source data format into target data format.

Talbert et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0078328) which disclosed a

system including method for completing a transaction between a customer and a

merchant.

Points of Contact

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Susan Y. Chen whose telephone number is 571-272-4016. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 7:00-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mofiz Apu can be reached on 571-272-4080. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Susan Y Chen
Examiner
Art Unit 2161

January 9, 2008